

# FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE

## Chair:

John S. Applegate

## Members:

James Bierer  
Marvin Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Pam Dunn  
Dr. Constance Fox  
Guy Guckenberger  
Darryl Huff  
Jerry Monahan  
Tom B. Rentschler  
Robert Tabor  
Warren E. Strunk  
Thomas Wagner  
Dr. Gene Willeke

## Alternates:

Russ Beckner  
Jackie Embry

## Ex Officio:

J. Phillip Hamric  
Graham Mitchell  
Jim Saric

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

## Minutes from December 9, 1993 Meeting

### Members Present:

John Applegate  
Jim Bierer  
Marvin Clawson  
Jack Craig, DOE  
Lisa Crawford  
Pam Dunn  
Connie Fox  
Guy Guckenberger  
Darryl Huff  
Jerry Monahan  
Tom Rentschler  
Jim Saric, U.S. EPA  
Tom Schneider, Ohio EPA  
Warren Strunk  
Robert Tabor  
Thomas Wagner  
Gene Willeke

About 12 spectators, including members of public, DOE, and FERMCO representatives.

### 1. Approval of Minutes:

- The draft minutes of the November 18, 1993, meeting of the Task Force were approved without amendment.

### 2. Discussion of Fernald Dosimetry Reconstruction Project:

Chair John Applegate reported that he has spoken to John Till of Radiological Assessments Corporation, which has been hired by the Centers for Disease Control to do the dosimetry reconstruction project for Fernald. Members of the project team had just presented their draft Task 2 and 3 Report, which estimated that total releases of uranium into the environment from Fernald during production years were about 1 million pounds -- about three times more than previously estimated.

Applegate had asked Till to explain the implications, if any, of the dosimetry reconstruction project on the Task Force's mission.

The project consists of several phases: reconstructing releases, studying pathways, estimating doses received by affected populations, and determining what health effects might be the result of this exposure.

Applegate reported that Till said there were no implications for the Task Force, and that the draft Task 2 and 3 report simply was a compilation of the historical data and modeling results to estimate releases from the Fernald facility. Release information does not translate directly into dose estimates, which is another step in the project. Applegate said Till emphasized that the researchers have no idea yet what the dose reconstruction report will indicate. He said the next report will examine the exposure pathways.

Applegate said that in terms of the current state of the site, the information about historical releases isn't really relevant to the Task Force's deliberations. The current information about contamination and its location is provided from current monitoring and sampling efforts.

Marvin Clawson said the Task 2 and 3 report goes into detail about "hot spots" and suggested the Task Force should be concerned about those areas when considering future use scenarios.

Gene Willeke said there has been concern about where the releases went from the Fernald facility. He said even people in Oxford are concerned about where the contamination traveled. He added that the dosimetry reconstruction project will help the Task Force because it will indicate where contamination went and where it didn't reach.

Jim Saric said a lot of the information contained in the dosimetry reconstruction project is being addressed in current cleanup activities at Fernald.

3. Presentation by Doug Sarno:

Applegate introduced Doug Sarno, who has been hired by the Task Force to assist with its deliberations on future use. Sarno is teamed with Triangle Associates, which supported the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group. Alice Shorett, the president of Triangle, and Martha Bean, will be working with Sarno to support the Task Force.

Sarno is the prime subcontractor. He said Shorett will assist in developing a process for the Task Force to keep on course. He described his experience with Superfund issues, explaining that he has focused for the past several years on public participation and future use issues. For the last five years, Sarno has been directing CleanSites, Inc., on how to make decisions at Superfund sites, and he authored a report on improving remedy selection. He also has worked with the Air Force on what it means to use future use as a consideration in cleanup. Sarno also has worked with U.S. EPA on team-building and public participation.

Triangle facilitated the process with the Hanford advisory group on future site uses. That group tackled the questions of what future use at Hanford is likely to be, where Hanford should go with future use considerations, etc.

Sarno's approach with the Fernald Citizens Task Force will be to assist and help guide the Task Force. He is not going to tell the Task Force how to run things; rather, he will help the Task Force develop a path forward that includes a focused process and common expectations of success. As coordinator, Sarno will help identify what products the Task Force wants to produce and when it wants to deliver them. He also will help the Task Force coordinate its work with the cleanup schedules at Fernald.

He will help task force members understand the information they need to make decisions. His job will be to collect the information and present the essential information necessary for decisionmaking.

Sarno will also help Task Force members understand the ramifications of their decisions in terms of cost and other impacts. The role of the coordinator is to help foster cooperation and communication to make sure that all interests are heard.

Sarno said Applegate has asked him to present Task Force members with a draft process and timeline at the January meeting. Task Force members need to start talking about future use options at the January meeting and to feed those options into the planning process.

Sarno will be in the area during the week prior to each Task Force meeting and available by phone to members. However, he asked that individual requests for work be coordinated through the chair.

Applegate said that Sarno will provide a schedule of meetings that

would include the topic of each meeting and the actions that need to be accomplished or the decisions that need to be decided at each of those meetings. To support that activity, Sarno will develop a decision agenda and research agenda of the information necessary in order to make decisions.

Sarno and Applegate suggested that two-hour monthly meetings might not be enough time for Task Force members to do this work. Applegate said the Task Force might want to consider meeting longer once a month.

Bob Tabor asked about the impact of the Operable Unit 4 (the K-65 Silos) schedule on the timing for future use. He wondered if the Task Force needed to respond to that schedule and have its recommendation ready this spring.

Sarno responded that he was aware of the schedules and said that the Operable Unit 4 schedule is not as critical as some people have been led to believe, because the ultimate cleanup levels for the soils and debris is not being decided now. The same is true with Operable Unit 1, the waste pit area. Off-site disposal does not impact ultimate future use, while the decisions about soils and debris are the ones affected by the future use recommendation. Right now the soils decisions are going to be made on the schedule for Operable Unit 5, environmental media. The schedules at Fernald do not make the Task Force's work irrelevant.

Jim Saric said DOE and EPA have been talking a lot about future land use issues over the last three or four weeks and have formulated a lot of ideas that would be helpful for the group. He suggested the group use the ideas that have resulted from these meetings to help with the discussion of future use. He also said Operable Unit 4 was important, adding that two other feasibility studies will be under review this spring.

Sarno said that the process of arriving at a future use recommendation was interactive with the agencies, adding that the Task Force will be providing relevant input between now and the deadline for the final recommendation. The Task Force will be part of the planning process.

Tom Rentschler said he was under the impression that the consultant would be talking to members one-on-one about constituencies and related issues. Applegate said that was going to happen prior to the next meeting, when Sarno would be talking individually with each

member of the Task Force. Sarno added that he still was learning about the site because he can't have a context for members' concerns without knowing about the site.

Rentschler said he still was not sure about the role of the Task Force. He said it would appear that the Task Force is working on a timetable to make recommendations that may not be used. He said he still is not sure that the Task Force recommendations will be timely or have a great deal of impact. He also said the Task Force does not seem to be accountable to anyone.

Applegate said the point of having a timetable for the Task Force is to make sure the Task Force is not irrelevant and to have regulators involved in the discussions so the recommendations have value.

Guy Guckenberger said he shared Rentschler's concern about the timing. He asked whether the Task Force would be making decisions soon enough. He said the Task Force needs to know when it must make decisions and what the consequences might be of not making decisions by those deadlines. However, he said he thought the Task Force recommendations, if made in a timely fashion, would have great weight, adding that if regulators don't use the recommendations, they must offer a public explanation as to why the recommendations weren't used.

Tom Schneider of Ohio EPA (representing Graham Mitchell) said that other decisions are being made, citing the Operable Unit 3 (former production area) interim proposed plan to decontaminate and decommission the buildings on site. So if the Task Force wanted to consider re-use of the buildings, that might not be considered by regulators.

Saric also said that some decisions about Operable Unit 4 also have been made relating to future use. He said right now a farmer cannot live on the site with the remedy being proposed.

Pam Dunn pointed out that people can comment on documents individually, even if the Task Force does not do so. She said that the agencies have to respond to public comments.

Jerry Monahan asked whether it were appropriate for the Task Force to discuss a proposed technology or process and comment to the agencies. Applegate said having the Task Force consider cleanup technologies might not be the most important issue to consider, given the mission of

the Task Force and the strategic questions identified in the charter.

Jim Bierer asked how effective advisory groups have been in getting DOE to accept their recommendations. Ken Morgan, the DOE Fernald Director of Public Information, cited Hanford as an example of how successful advisory groups can be. He said there were three different groups that had a great deal of impact with their recommendations. For example, Morgan said that Hanford's already-reached cementation plans were scrapped in favor of vitrification, due to public concerns. Sarno also said he understood that the Hanford report on future use would be the blueprint for cleanup there.

Jack Craig said that signed Record of Decisions can be changed. He said that the timeline of how the Task Force will integrate with the cleanup schedules will be good to visualize.

Sarno assured Task Force members that they would not "miss the boat." He said the current environment within DOE assures that site-specific advisory boards will be very effective.

Rentschler suggested that the Task Force might want to begin issuing tentative position papers to make clear the representation and interests on the Task Force. He said this might be useful because not all members are community activists or vocal or well-known.

Lisa Crawford said it might be useful to spend time airing people's opinions. She said the Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health (FRESH) does not represent everyone in the area, adding that she wants to hear what other groups have to say. She said she hopes the Task Force will broaden the approach to public participation and allow all voices to be heard.

Applegate said the Task Force needed to rethink the way it meets in order to accomplish its work. He said he was reluctant to change the January meeting too much, and suggested meeting from 5 to 8 p.m. and work during the meal. But Applegate said that holding late meetings might not be wise because many members come directly from work. He asked about meeting Saturdays.

- Gene Willeke moved that the Task Force meet Saturday, January 15, 1994. The Task Force would decide then if it wanted to continue Saturday meetings. Jim Bierer seconded the motion. The motion passed 17 to 1.

4. Discussion of Draft Site Development Plan:

Jerry Krieger of FERMCO discussed the draft Site Development Plan and its relevance to the Task Force. He said the plan does not circumvent the Task Force and create a future land use plan. Rather, the purpose of the draft Site Development Plan is to comply with a DOE order; although the order has been in existence for some time, Fernald never has had a plan before. It is required to be updated annually.

Krieger said the order was written to facilitate planning efforts with production facilities; the site development plans were supposed to give senior managers information for making decisions about building new structures, hiring more employees, etc.

The Site Development Plan is not intended to be a public document; however, he said DOE invited the Task Force to comment on the draft plan. He asked that comments be provided by the Task Force meeting in January -- either on the document itself or in a separate submission - and given to him. Then the Task Force will have a response to its comments by its February meeting.

5. Public Participation:

A member of the audience said he thought the Task Force would not be able to decide on future use until it had an idea of where the waste would go. Applegate agreed that the issues of waste disposition and future use were related.

Crawford suggested reminding the public that information about the Task Force is available for review in the Public Environmental Information Center. Bierer suggested that detailed announcements about meetings also be made.

6. Materials Distributed at Meeting:

- Updated Table of Contents for Briefing Books
- Federal Facilities Compliance Act
- 2 Fact Sheets on the Federal Facilities Compliance Act
- Binder Divider -- Letter "P"
- Resume of Doug Sarno
- Resume of Alice Shorett

7. Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the full Task Force is scheduled for 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. on January 15, 1994, at the Meadowbrook.

The meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

Approved January 15, 1994